[redacted]

DoD ABIS: Quality Evaluation of Operational Multi-Modal Biometric Data

Bob Carter
Lockheed Martin
DoD Biometrics

LOCKHEED MARTIN
Information Technology

Outline

- Motivation/Problem Statement
- Operational Setting
- Multi-Modal Biometric Data
  - Fingerprint
  - Face
  - Iris
- Challenges

Motivation

[redacted]

- Quality of data affects system performance
  - Processing time
  - Validity of results
- Quality-adaptive processing
  - Thresholds sensitive to quality of probe & gallery samples
- Multi-modal fusion
  - Quality drives order of processing
  - Quality a factor into score/decision combination
  - Quality-sensitive thresholds

Operational Setting

[redacted]

- DoD BMO Biometric Collection SOP
  - 10(14) finger images, 5 face photos, 2 iris images
- Overworked, under-trained, collectors
  - often under stressful (life-threatening) conditions
  - often in a harsh environment (lighting, temperature, etc.)
- Substantial amount of legacy data (10+ years old)
  - paper fingerprint cards that have been exposed to severe environmental conditions
  - scanned images of Polaroid photos that have been stapled and exposed to the elements
- Highest reliability desired
  - National security at stake

Fingerprint

[redacted]

- Evaluation methods
- Data sample
- Quality findings

Finger Image Quality Evaluation

[redacted]

- NFIQ - NIST Finger Image Quality
  - Range of 1-5
  - Related to minutia matcher performance
- FIQM - Finger Image Quality Measurement
  - Range of 0-100
  - Related to human perception
- ENM - Equivalent Number of Minutia
  - Range of 0-85
  - Related to quality of print near each minutia and its neighbors

Quality Measures

[redacted]

	NFIQ = 1	NFIQ = 5
ENM = 25		
ENM = 20		
ENM = 21		
ENM = 17		

Finger Quality Findings I [redacted]



NFIQ



ENM

LOCKHEED MARTIN
Information Technology

Finger Quality Findings II



LOCKHEED MARTIN
Information Technology

Finger Quality Correlation?

[redacted]

	NFIQ	ENM	ENM per Minutia	FIQM
NFIQ	1			
ENM	-0.355	1		
ENM per Minutia	-0.588	0.782	1	
FIQM	-0.775	0.434	0.687	1

Face

[redacted]

- Evaluation methods
- Data sample
- Quality findings

Face Image Quality Evaluation [redacted]

- Identix FaceIt Quality Assessment
  - 11 dimensions
    - darkness, brightness, exposure, focus, resolution, cropping, glasses, faceness, contrast, texture, and faceFindingConfidence
  - Overall Quality computed as:
    - minimum(darkness, brightness, focus, resolution, cropping, faceness, contrast)
    - 0.0-3.9 : Bad
    - 4.0-6.9 : Fair
    - 7.0-10.0 : Good

Face Data Quality Issues

[redacted]

- Cluttered background
- Legacy data – e.g. scans of 10+ year-old Polaroids
- Non-frontal pose
- Inconsistent lighting
- Multiple heads
- Low resolution

Face Quality Findings I



LOCKHEED MARTIN
Information Technology

Face Quality Findings II

LOCKHEED MARTIN
Information Technology

Face Identification Performance and Quality



LOCKHEED MARTIN
Information Technology

Iris

[redacted]

- Evaluation methods
- Quality findings

Iris Image Quality Evaluation

[redacted]

- Method of Kalka and Schmid from WVU
- 7 dimensions
  - Occlusion, motion blur, defocus blur, lighting, pixel counts, specular reflection and off-angle
  - Overall quality computed by applying Dempster-Shafer method using Murphy's rule to normalized (0.0-1.0) dimensions

Iris Quality Findings I [redacted]



LOCKHEED MARTIN
Information Technology

Relative Iris Quality



WVU and CASIA Iris Quality Scores courtesy of Nate Kalka, WVU

LOCKHEED MARTIN
Information Technology

Iris Quality Findings II



LOCKHEED MARTIN
Information Technology

Iris Identification Performance and Quality

[redacted]



LOCKHEED MARTIN
Information Technology

Challenges

[redacted]

- Need real-time feedback at point of collection
- Need either
  - generic, algorithm-agnostic quality metrics
  - or, algorithm (vendor)-specific quality metrics
- Want performance-predictive metrics
- Machine perception and/or human perception?
- Need to understand tradeoff involving very low quality data
  - can we quantify diminishing returns?
  - can we justify excluding some samples?

Collaboration Opportunity [redacted]

- We have plenty of real-world data.
  - Unfortunately, not for public dissemination
- However, we welcome the chance to evaluate new ideas using our data set for mutual benefit.
  - WVU – iris image quality assessment
  - BAH – finger image quality assessment
- POC:

robert.l.carter@lmco.com

Questions?